the 6-month period described in subparagraph (A)(ii), the unit of general local government shall dispose of the multifamily housing project or other residential property on a negotiated, competitive bid, or other basis, on such terms as the unit of general local government deems appropriate.

(c) EXEMPTION FROM PROPERTY DISPOSITION REQUIREMENTS.—No provision of the Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994, or any amendment made by that Act, shall apply to the disposition of property in accordance with this section.

(d) TENANT LEASES.—This section shall not affect the terms or the enforceability of any contract or lease entered into before the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) PROCEDURES.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish, by rule, regulation, or order, such procedures as may be necessary to carry out this section.

MCCAIN (AND ROCKEFELLER) AMENDMENT NO. 3059

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, S. 2168, supra; as follows:

On page 93, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

SEC. 423. Effective as of the date of enactment of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Public Law 105–178), the Veterans Benefits Act of 1998 (subtitle B of title VIII of the Transportation Equity Act for 21st Century) is repealed and shall be treated as if not enacted.

MCCAIN AMENDMENT NO. 3060

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2168, supra; as follows:

On page 93, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

SEC. 423. (a) Each entity that receives a grant from the Federal Government for purposes of providing emergency shelter for homeless individuals shall—

(1) ascertain, to the extent practicable, whether or not each adult individual seeking such shelter from such entity is a veteran; and

(2) provide each such individual who is a veteran such counseling relating to the availability of veterans benefits (including employment assistance, health care benefits, and other benefits) as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs considers appropriate.

(b) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall jointly coordinate the activities required by subsection (a).

(c) Entities referred to in subsection (a) shall notify the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of the number and identity of veterans ascertained under paragraph (1) of that subsection. Such entities shall make such notification with such frequency and in such form as the Secretary shall specify.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an entity referred to subsection (a) that fails to meet the requirements specified in that subsection shall not be eligible for additional grants or other Federal funds for purposes of carrying out activities relating to emergency shelter for homeless individuals.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REAUTHORIZING THE OFFICE OF THE DRUG CZAR

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, for the past two weeks I have been working with Senator GORDON SMITH, Senator BIDEN and others to reach an agreement so that the legislation reauthorizing the office of the so-called Drug Czar, H.R. 2610, can move forward. I do not object to the reauthorization, but have been prevented from offering an amendment to the measure and will not give my consent to adoption of the Drug Czar bill until we have reached agreement on my amendment. The amendment I wish to offer is bipartisan legislation Senator GORDON SMITH and I have sponsored in response to the gun violence that struck Thurston High School in Springfield, Oregon. The bill, S. 2169, would provide an incentive for states to enact a 72-hour holding period for students that bring guns to schools so that the students who bring guns to school may be fully and thoroughly evaluated by professionals. The President has endorsed our proposal, and it is my hope that we can reach a consensus that allows the Senate to pass both the Drug Czar measure and the Wyden-Smith bill.●

TRADE LAW ENFORCEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1998

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, on Friday, June 26th, the day the Senate adjourned for the July 4th recess, I introduced the Trade Law Enforcement Improvement Act of 1998. This bill would clarify an ambiguity in an important U.S. antitrust law and thereby ensure that U.S. law will be effectively utilized to combat anticompetitive foreign cartels, acts, and conspiracies designed to unfairly exclude American products from overseas markets.

The principal aim of my bill is to codify the U.S. Department of Justice's (DOJ) current—and correct—interpretation of the Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvements Act of 1982 (FTAIA) which is currently embodied in Footnote 62 of the International Antitrust Guidelines. This footnote makes it clear that there are no unnecessary jurisdictional obstacles to challenging anticompetitive acts and conspiracies that take place outside our borders.

The FTAIA authorized the U.S. to assert jurisdiction over anticompetitive conduct abroad that has a ''direct, substantial and reasonably foreseeable'' effect on export trade or commerce or those engaged in export trade or commerce with foreign nations. However, in 1998 DOJ issued International Enforcement Guidelines which included Footnote 159, a new interpretation of FTAIA confining U.S. enforcement efforts solely to anticompetitive conduct that affected U.S. consumers, without regard to its effect on U.S. exporters. Specifically, the footnote announced that henceforth ''the Department [would be] concerned only with adverse effects on competition that would harm U.S. consumers * * *.''

Fortunately, in 1992, DOJ announced that Footnote 159 would be superseded by a policy which recognized that harm to U.S. exporters was sufficient to trigger an antitrust enforcement action regardless of whether there were harmful effects on U.S. consumers. Thus, the interpretation was revised to affirmatively permit DOJ to enforce ''our antitrust laws against anticompetitive practices that harm U.S. commerce.'' That interpretation now appears in Footnote 62 of the current International Enforcement Guidelines.

While the correction to Footnote 159 was drafted by Assistant Attorney General Jim Rill in the Bush Administration, it is important to note that it has been fully endorsed by the Clinton Administration. Assistant Attorneys General Rill, Bingaman, and Klein should all be recognized and commended for their strong leadership in strengthening international antitrust enforcement and for bringing cases under the authority of the FTAIA.

Let me describe why this provision in our trade law is so important and why it is crucial that it be properly interpreted and enforced.

The opening of global markets has advanced America's current economic prosperity, but it also poses fundamental challenges for U.S. antitrust laws. One example is the U.S. flat glass industry. For the better part of a decade, America's leading flat glass producers have been seeking access to the Japanese market, the largest and richest in Asia. American companies are already leaders in producing and selling high-quality innovative glass products around the world. U.S. firms have been very successful in Europe, Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America—but not yet Japan. The fact is that securing effective distribution channels for American glass has not proved to be a significant barrier to entry in any country other than Japan.

It is not for a lack of trying. In 1992, President Bush and Japanese Prime Minister Miyazawa negotiated an agreement in which Japan committed that the Japan Fair Trade Commission (JFTC) would study anticompetitive practices in the flat glass sector. For over a quarter-century, the Japanese market has been controlled by a cartel, consisting of the three leading Japanese producers—Asahi, Nippon, and Central. Because of the cartel, market shares for the three companies have been remarkably constant: Asahi has had a 50% market share, Nippon has had 30%, and Central has had 20% for nearly three decades, while other major markets in Europe and North America have undergone dramatic competitive shifts.

When the JFTC, one year later, issued its report, it found a long-standing history of anticompetitive practices in the Japanese flat glass industry, but concluded that enforcement action was ''inappropriate.''